

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

7 JOHN DOE #1, et al.,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 SAM REED, et al.,

11 Defendants.

CASE NO. C09-5456BHS

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
FILE OVERLENGTH
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

12
13 This matter comes before the court on Plaintiffs' motion to file an overlength
14 summary judgment motion (Dkt. 194). The Court has reviewed the brief filed in favor of
15 the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for the reasons
16 stated herein.¹

17 On June 24, 2011, Plaintiffs moved the Court to permit them to file a 96-page
18 motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs affirm that 24 of the pages are argument and the
19 balance is purely factual. Plaintiffs concede that 24 pages is the limit set for such motions
20 by the rules.


21 While circumstances may exist to warrant an extension beyond what the rules
22 permit, this is not one of them. In accord with the rules, Plaintiffs may file their 24-page
23 motion for summary judgment and accompany that motion with a relevant set of
24

25
26
27 ¹Defendants have not had an opportunity to respond to this brief. However, because of
28 the Court's ruling herein, Defendants need not file a brief either supporting or opposing
Plaintiffs' motion (Dkt. 194).

1 supporting documents to which their motion refers, e.g., depositions, declarations, and
2 exhibits. Such is the typical and preferred course when dealing with a fact intensive case.

3 Based on the foregoing, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiffs' motion to file an overlength
4 summary judgment motion.

5 DATED this 27th day of June, 2011.

6
7 
8 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28